

## THE CENTRAL UNIVERSITY CASE.

Nothing is really settled until it is settled aright. A quietus may be put upon it, but it will not down in the hearts and minds and convictions of men.

This was suggested by a comment written to us, that it was thought the controversy touching Central University was ended when the General Assembly dismissed the recent complaint and struck out all personal reflections from the papers connected with it. Further comment was made upon our editorial note concerning the Board's dealing fairly with the Carnegie Foundation in declaring "complete and vital sympathy with the Presbyterian church" and "the perpetuation of those traditions, relations and fundamental principles."

So far as our criticism of the public matter of the University's relation to the Carnegie Foundation bore upon the Board's action, we most cheerfully withdraw everything that seemed to indicate or suggest that the Board acted in bad faith by the Foundation. We do this in view of the statements to us of a dearly beloved brother, long a high official of the institution, who writes, "Dr. Pritchett has been familiar with every phase of the whole transaction. He has on file in the office of the Foundation every paper adopted by the Board, and every communication that has been published in the church papers. More, he came to Danville, saw for himself the workings of the institution, conferred with President Hinitt, and eight or ten of the trustees, went over the whole ground with us, and approved of the paper from which your editorial claims to have quoted."

The fact that the board of trustees of the university carefully laid before Dr. Pritchett, the agent of the Carnegie Foundation, every act and document, including the paper which was submitted to the Synod and Assembly declaring the institution's "complete and vital sympathy with the Presbyterian Church," while it should acquit the Board, in the public mind, from criticism as to this feature of the case, does not, however, remove the question which many who have interest in the case are asking, viz.: How came it about that the Carnegie Foundation could accept and provide for Central University? Did its agent read carefully and take in fully the meaning of the "purpose and determination" of the Board of Trustees? Was he given leave to ignore in this case the principles governing the administration of the Foundation? Did he think that the "purpose and determination" and the "relation of complete and vital sympathy" would be evanescent, that the time would soon come, when under the soothing spell of the appropriations, this purpose and vital sympathy would sink out of sight?

For information of all interested, and as a warrant for the wonder which many feel, we give the following paragraphs; the first from the Board's paper to the Synod and Assembly, and the second from the rules regulating the administration of the Carnegie Foundation and defining the institutions which should be excluded from its benefactions:

"They further desire to express their full appreciation of the history and traditions of the institution, its long life of service in connection with the Presbyterian Church, and its devotion to the maintenance

and propagation of the truths of the Christian religion, and in this connection to pledge themselves to the perpetuation of these traditions, relations and fundamental principles in the future of the institution. It is our earnest purpose and determination to guard the religious life and character of the institution and to develop its influence with the fundamental purpose of fidelity to the principles of Christian education and in relation of complete and vital sympathy with the Presbyterian Church."—Action of Board of Central University. There are excluded "Institutions which have no formal connection with a denomination, but a strong sympathetic one, and which are generally looked upon as denominational."—Carnegie Foundation.

## SAFE AND HAPPY MARRIAGES.

There can be no cessation in the protest against the shameful evil of multiplied divorces. The moral foundations of society are in issue, the sanctity of marriage, the happiness of the home and the salvation of children from an utter moral ruin. In the Southern States of this country, where the population is so largely homogeneous, conservative, moral and religious, we hear much less of divorce and family disruption than in other sections. Certainly such things are not often so conspicuous, flagrant, and publicly disgraceful as elsewhere. But it is yet due that we need to set up all the moral defenses which we can find against the gross evils of a so-called upper society.

In one of the monthly magazines Cardinal Gibbons, the head of the Roman Catholic church in this country, writes on marriage and divorce from the Romish standpoint; that the sacrament of marriage is indissoluble, and divorce is in every case a violation of the Law of God. He evidently thinks that the safety of our people and of their morals and happiness is in the Church of Rome. But our people can not forget that the Papal See has always exercised the inconsistent right of dissolving marriage, and sanctioned many marriages after divorce. Nor can it be forgotten that in Catholic countries, with the so-called indissoluble marriage, immorality abounds. The absence of divorce is the occasion of all manner of violations of good morals.

A distinguished judge in the northwest of long and large experience in the courts has replied to Cardinal Gibbons most vigorously. He affirms that separation and divorce have often been absolutely necessary for the moral welfare of all concerned, and for the peace and purity of society and the commonwealth. He declares that there are cases coming to the knowledge of the courts in which it would be a far greater wrong to compel the parties to dwell together in marriage than to release them, thereby bringing, to an innocent party, the possibility of a new and happier life.

The great body of Reformed Churches, since the Reformation and separation from the Church of Rome, have held that the Law of God, as taught and interpreted by the Lord Jesus, authorized and sanctioned separation in the extreme cases of adultery and desertion. This is accepted as taught in the Confession of Faith: "Nothing but adultery, or such wilful desertion, as can no way be remedied by the church or